DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 240 UD 017 354

AUTHOR Romero, Dan
TITLE The Impact and Use of Minority Faculty Within a University.
PUB DATE 30 Aug 77
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (San Francisco, Calif., August 30, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Pluralism; *Doctoral Programs; Graduate Students; *Higher Education; *Mexican Americans; *Minority Groups; *Minority Group Teachers; *Psychology; Role Models

ABSTRACT

In this paper the impact and utilization of minority faculty within predominantly white universities is discussed. The relationship between minority students and faculty is identified. Specific mention is made of data assembled by the National Board on Graduate Education which demonstrates the underrepresentation of minority students and faculty members in accredited doctoral psychology programs. Literature pertaining to minority faculty participation in white universities is reviewed; particular attention is paid to the roles of Chicano faculty members. A pilot questionnaire, mailed to 67 Chicano academics in psychology and/or education is described; some of the results from the 19 responses are cited. The concept of academic colonialism and the selective imposition of intellectual premises, methods, concepts, and related organizational styles on a subordinate group, is discussed in relation to recruitment and promotion of students and faculty. Mention is also made of pressure to assimilate white roles and values, perhaps stronger for Chicano faculty than for black faculty. It is recommended that universities increase their attention to these problems and make an effort to remedy them through more investigation, information, and the implementation of curriculum materials which deal with cultural pluralism, particularly in graduate psychology programs. (Author/GC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146240

THE IMPACT AND USE OF MINORITY FACULTY WITHIN A UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dan Romero

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Dan Romero

University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

CG017354

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Psychological Association
August 26 - 30, 1977
San Francisco, California

No portion of this paper may be reproduced without the permission of the author.

ABSTRACT

The relationship of Psychology to ethnic minorities has received little attention in existing psychological literature. A particular topic which has received virtually no attention has been the impact and use of minority faculty within predominately white universities. The paper reviews existing literature focusing on the relationship between minorities and universities. Specific attention is focused on recruitment and retention of both faculty and graduate students. A sorely neglected topic has been the study of Chicano faculty in the university. Preliminary data concerning the role of the Chicano faculty member are reported. Several recommendations are made regarding areas needing further exploration.

THE IMPACT AND USE OF MINORITY FACULTY WITHIN A UNIVERSITY

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the impact and utilization of minority faculty within predominately white universities. While a commitment to recruit and retain ethnic minorities as graduate students has been documented in the last decade, knowledge concerning the status of minority faculty is virtually non-existent. In one of the first and few national surveys of university faculty to include a category for ethnicity, Bayer (1973) reported only 0.9% of university faculty were Black and even smaller proportions were Mexican American, Puerto Rican, or Native American. It appears the pool of doctorate-trained minorities available for faculty appointments in universities will increase very slowly over the next five years unless recent trends are modified. In arriving at this conclusion, the National Board on Graduate Education (NBGE, 1976) examined data provided by the Annual Survey of Earned Doctorates for trends in doctoral attainment. The NBGE predicted a slight increase in the availability of Black Ph.D.'s in the next few years, but no increase could be predicted for Ph.D.'s earned by Mexican Americans or Native Americans.

RATIONALE

The National Board on Graduate Education (1976), in an extensive report on the participation of minority groups in graduate education, concluded that as members of higher education faculties, minority men and women bring a wealth of intellectual talents and skills for all persons. In addition such minority persons serve as role models for

future generations and can become agents of change for society and for socioeconomic mobility of minority groups.

The NBGE (1976) felt that:

> Increased minority participation in graduate education is an important national goal to be realized for the social, economic, intellectual, and cultural well-being of all persons. It is for the collective benefit of society that the representation of minority group persons among those earning advanced degrees be increased. (pp. 1-2)

This paper, then makes a subjective statement about the status of minority group participation in white universities. Four sections are included in the paper. The first section identifies the relationship between minority students and faculty in predominately white universities with specific concentration on the conclusions of the National Board on Graduate Education (1976). The second section reviews literature pertaining to minority faculty participation in white universities with particular attention to the status of Chicano faculty. The third section is designed to cite preliminary results of a pilot questionnaire to Chicano faculty and to share some of their comments. The fourth section is a synthesis of the preceding sections with proposed directions for future research.

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF MINORITY STUDENTS AND FACULTY

The need for expanding career opportunities for minority persons in graduate education institutions is based on a variety of social, moral, and educational convictions established in the last decade. This need, however, has not resulted in a higher level of recruitment and retention of both minority faculty and graduate students. The demand for expanding faculties in higher education has deteriorated because of leveling and

projected declines in higher education enrollments. The "old boy" network used extensively in higher education (Lester, 1974) has traditionally recruited through personal contacts and has effectively excluded sprouting minority networks of contacts. The effects of Affirmative Action programs have been dubious and, in any case, the concept of Affirmative Action will soon be severely tested in the courts with the outcome very much in doubt. Promotion and tenure committees as well as departmental faculty have often viewed minority faculty on the periphery of academe in terms of academic credibility, recognition, status, and participation in the total academic enterprise. It is not surprising, therefore, that despite a decade of increased activity to promote minority participation in graduate education, few minority men and women hold academic positions in universities, and that a relatively stable period of recruitment for minority graduate students and new minority faculty can be predicted for the near future.

The inability of psychology programs to recruit and retain minority students and faculty has paralleled the general trend in educational access for minority group members. Recent data assembled by the American Psychological Association, Educational Affairs Office (1977) reveals underrepresentation of minority students and faculty members in accredited doctoral psychology programs. Tables 1 and 2 summarize the distribution of faculty and graduate students for accredited psychology programs.

- -

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here

- -

As one ascends the pyramidal hierarchy of instructor to full professor, it should be noted that the percentage of whites increase dramatically with a concurrent decrease in the percentage of minorities. The data supports an earlier contention that minority faculty are viewed as peripheral in terms of participation and control of academia. Jacobs and Wolman (1977) have summarize the phenomenon:

> Academics are tightly organized into a pyramidal hierarchy which calls itself a meritocracy. According to the professed rules of Academe, one must show more merit than one's peers and thus worthy of promotion, or stop being an Academic. Excellence is judged and promotions are controlled by those at the top of the hierarchy. The majority of Academics are white males, and the percentage of white males increases dramatically as one glances up the hierarchy. (p. 256)

Although the exclusion of minorities as faculty and students in universities has been established in specific psychology programs (Boxley & Wagner, 1971) and other academic disciplines such as sociology (Blackwell, Jackson, & Moore, 1977), the issue has received scarce attention.

The inability of psychology to attract ethnic minorities as faculty and students may be reflected by the inability of the major professional organization, the American Psychological Association (APA), to attract and promote ethnic minorities in leadership positions. For example, the APA Council of Representatives was composed of 119 members in 1976 with more than 99% classified as white. More than 91% of the 437 APA governing unit members for 1976 were classified as white. The NBGE (1976) summarized the critical role of professional societies and associations:

> Only when the established leaders of the society--its successful researchers, Nobel laureates, prize winners, officeholders--become centrally concerned and involved with equal opportunity programs will the members view these programs as important enough to require action and commitment to complement rhetoric and good intentions. (pp. 177-78)

The NBGE recommended that professional associations draw upon the prestige and talents of members and assign a high priority to recruitment, retention, and training of minorities in both graduate study and the professions. The Board expressed hope that such efforts would be central, *not peripheral*, to the mainstream of association activities to ensure commitment to the viability and success of equal educational opportunities.

Taylor (1976) has argued eloquently for recruitment, retention, and training of ethnic minority students in psychology programs. He reported the receipt by APA of a six-year development grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Minority Groups Mental Health Programs. The grant is designed to increase the number of ethnic minorities in psychology by awarding fellowships to selected students. For optimal success in the recruitment, retention, and training of ethnic minority graduate students, he identified a need to modify existing practices and standards. Taylor (1976) writes:

> . . .outcomes can be effected by establishing better support systems *within psychology departments for ethnic minorities. Three factors* are important to the establishment of such a support system:
>
> (1) A critical mass of ethnic minorities within the student population. Students can be very supportive of one another.
> (2) A critical mass of ethnic minorities within the faculty ranks.
> (3) A modification of the curriculum so as to include other perspectives and assumptions.
>
> (pp. 146-47)

The NBGE (1976) reviewed endeavors of public and private organizations in addition to professional societies as active agents in the development of graduate opportunities for minorities. These organizations included business and industry, philanthropic foundations, state governments, and federal agencies. The NBGE report, however, placed the primary responsibility for the recruitment and retention of minority students upon graduate

institutions. Further, the Board felt outside financial assistance should be viewed as a complement to, not a substitute for, existing institutional activities. The NBGE report cited three forms of institutional responses to minority group participation in graduate schools: (1) the "active" institution; (2) the "dedicated few" institution; and (3) the "non-active" institution.

Typically the "active" institution had a graduate minority student program with sub-program and formal activities. Such an institution employed significant numbers of minority faculty and other minority support staff specifically responsible for recruitment and other activities. Without exception, these "active" institutions had allocated both financial and institutional resources toward the support of minority graduate students.

The second response form derived from the efforts of a few dedicated individuals withing the universities. For example, these individuals may have obtained external funds to support the special program, or may work with severely limited institutional resources in funding a few minority students. The drawback of such efforts lie in the dependence on the intensity and longevity of the personal efforts made by a few individuals.

The third institutional response to minority group participation was the "non-active" response. Few minority graduate students were enrolled with fewer minority faculty present. Financial constraints were advanced as reasons for a lack of action. Discussions with faculty, administrators, and minority spokespeople clearly indicated that although formally endorsed, minority concerns were not operationally supported through financial commitments.

The Board endorsed the "active" institutional response and encouraged strong commitment and involvement of faculty in all institutional activities to create an environment supportive of minority student achievement.

A final issue to consider is the relationship between minority faculty and minority graduate students. A strong, direct relationship exists between the number of minority faculty within a department or university and the number of ethnic minority students who are recruited and retained in graduate programs. As Taylor (1976) reported, a "critical mass" of both minority students and faculty within graduate programs is vital for the establishment of a support system designed to meet the needs of minority populations. The third element described by Taylor, modification of the curriculum, will be addressed in the final section of this paper.

The thesis of this first section has been that the relationship among minority graduate students, minority university faculty, and professional organzational leadership is direct and linear. Moreover, any increase in one area of concern will be directly related to increases in the other areas.

The NBGE (1976) report stated that realism and pragmatism of the 1970's has replaced the tensions of the 1960's regarding the prospects for minority participation in graduate education. Jones (1977) cited the unwillingness on the part of government and other institutions to intervene on behalf of minority progress. For Jones the current mood is one of "benign neglect" which has stimulated individuals to devote energy to monitoring minority group progress in the professions. Information about the progress of minority group participation in higher education over the last five years has elicited sharp disagreement. Data concerning the recruitment and retention of minority is sporadic, sometimes contradictory, and extremely difficult to generalize from both within and among universities.

MINORITY FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN WHITE UNIVERSITIES

While data concerning the status of minority student participation

in graduate education is variable, and contradictory, knowledge concerning the status of minority faculty in predominately white institutions is virtually non-existent. A predominately white institution refers to post-secondary schools in which the students, faculty, and/or administrative populations are each more than 90% Caucasian. In recent years studies of minority faculty in white institutions have considered almost exclusively the plight of Black faculty (Mommsen, 1970; Staples, 1972; Egerton, 1971; and Bryant, 1970). Moore and Wagstaff (1974) cite more than a dozen investigations into the situations faced by Black educators in white colleges and universities. While a network for Black educators to deal with such situations has developed, similar networks for Native Americans and the Spanish-speaking have been slow to form.

Smith (1975) used informal interviews to examine the status of Black counselor educators in predominately white universities. She cited the difficulty Black counselor educators face with the term "qualified":

> Whereas Blacks see this label as a convenient way of perpetuating the myth of Black interiority, whites claim that is refers only to one's competency level and not to one's race. . . .Blacks . . . object to the term "qualified" on three grounds: (a) It is a term reserved exclusively for Blacks; (b) the looseness of this label makes it a convenient loophole for keeping a university faculty white; and (c) it does not refer to job performance criteria. (p. 86)

Smith (1975) also discussed other problems facing Black faculty including problems related to student recruitment, the concept of "blanket identity", the "surely you should know" syndrome, and casting aspersions.

In spite of questioning the role and purpose of Black counselor educators in white universities, Smith (1975) reported an even stronger pressure:

> Yet, the greatest and most insidious pressure I have experienced has been the attempt of others (attempts that were at times more unconscious than conscious)

> to make me become what I am not or what I do not ever want to become—a white person or at least a carbon copy of one. Adjusting or acclimating oneself to the idiosyncrasies of a particular institution is one thing, but undergoing a racial and cultural metamorphosis is another, and it should not be the criteria for Black professionals to maintain their jobs. (p. 93)

The pressure to assimilate white roles and values within the university may be stronger for Chicano faculty than for Black faculty. Arce (1976) recently attempted to conceptualize the issue of role definition for Chicanos in higher education. Demographically, he reported that although estimates of Chicano faculty range from 2000 to 5000, even the high figure constitutes less than 1% of the total U. S. college faculty. He noted the underrepresentation of Chicano faculty is particularly acute at the university level where less than 600 Chicanos are employed as faculty nationally. Arce (1976) identified significant implications deriving from the difficulty of identifying Chicano faculty:

> The most serious implication of these figures is that, even using the lower estimates, a very large proportion of the Chicano faculty does not have high visibility among organized Chicano academics. This would indicate that among Chicano academics, cultural tenacity and ethnic commitment are neither as strong nor as uniform as is often suggested by ethnic spokesmen in the literature or in conferences. If this is in fact true, we may need to assess more realistically the expectations we have of increased educational attainment and to develop and operationalize strategies for preventing the internal class stratification of the Chicano population and the exodus of its more educated individuals. (p. 17)

An additional critical issue developed by Arce (1976) is the concept of academic colonialism as adapted from Borda (1970). Academic colonialism involves the selective imposition of intellectual premises, methods, concepts, and related organizational styles on a subordinate group. Academic premises and methods are unquestionably adopted by selected members of the subordinate group. Arce (1976) identified a central feature of academic colonialism--monopoly through controlled access. Major colonizing con-

ditions reinforce the traditional academic structure because only a few have access to the resources which promote advancement in the academic enterprise. These resources include the institutional decision making positions (department chair, dean, vice president, and president), foundation and government funding agency review boards, journal editorial and review positions, and offices and committee memberships in professional organizations. Only limited and controlled access to these resources are available to minorities. Efforts by university Chicano faculty to meet academic demands and to generate Chicano involvement, and efforts to synthesize the two are rarely recognized for professional development and are seldom rewarded professionally by advancement in the academic pyramid. The use and impact of minority faculty in general, and of Chicano faculty in particular, has received little research attention. The 1976 article by Arce represents an initial conceptualization of the relationship between Chicano faculty and white universities. Substantial data concerning both demographic information and role perceptions are needed to verify or to refute Arce's claims.

PRELIMINARY DATA CONCERNING CHICANO FACULTY

In order to assess the impact and usage of Chicano faculty within predominately white universities, a preliminary questionnaire was constructed and mailed to 67 Chicano faculty in Psychology and/or Education for their reaction and review. Faculty were selected from the 1974 Chicano Ph.D. list available from the Office of Chicano Affairs, Stanford University. The faculty sample was selected as recipients of the questionnaire based on the presence in the Stanford list of a university address. Thus, the sample was one of convenience designed to elicit responses and comments

to a pilot questionnaire to be refined for futher use. The questionnaire and accompanying cover letter will be provided upon request.

Five questionnaires were returned unopened with no forwarding addresses available. Two questionnaires were returned unanswered--one from a Chicano no longer a faculty member and the second from a respondent who declined to complete the questionnaire. All but the one declining to respond were removed from the sample. The final sample consisted of 51 males and 10 females. Responses have been received from 16 male and 3 female Chicano faculty for a response rate of 31%. A follow-up questionnaire will be mailed in mid-September to coincide with the beginning of the fall semester. With the relatively small return rate at this time, in an initially restricted sample, it is currently impossible to draw generalizations from the responses received. However, the questionnaire was intended to be reviewed and to generate comment which can be shared in the present report. Table 3 presents selected demographic information about the Chicano faculty respondents to date. From the data presented in Table 3, it can be stated that early respondents to the questionnaire represent Chicano faculty who hold a relatively high academic rank, are tenured or on a tenure ladder, who are older, and who have been well established in academia.

- -

Insert Table 3 about here

- -

Additionally, *all* respondents reported less than 10% of their total university faculty were minority. *Seventy percent* of the faculty reported that less than 1% of the overall university faculty at their institutions were Chicano. Regarding role identification, respondents were asked to

circle the term with which they felt most comfortable in refering to their ethnic background. The majority (64%) selected Chicano; next was Mexican American, and comfort with all terms (12% each). Spanish-surnamed, Spanish-speaking, and Hispano were also selected. While the term Chicano was the most prevalent label, there clearly was variability suggesting there is no uniformity in ethnic role identification at this time among Chicano faculty. This is paralleled by a role confusion in the general population.

Table 4 presents the response patterns of the Chicano faculty to selected questions. These faculty members believe they have impacted curriculum by incorporating cultural issues into the university and departmental offerings (Question 12). The faculty, however, were somewhat skeptical that such

- -

Insert Table 4 about here

- -

curriculum changes representing cultural pluralism would have been made had no minorities been employed (Question 8).

The time appears to be ripe for examining and reconsidering curricular offerings. Mental health minority professionals, for example, are reconceptualizing program content to reflect cultural diversity (Padilla, Ruiz, & Alvarez, 1975; Sue, 1977). Curriculum modification has been proposed as an essential ingredient in developing minority student support systems (Taylor, 1976). However, descriptions and evaluations of curriculum modules that explore the importance of culture as a variable in human interaction are not apparent in the existing literature.

Many professionals and professors in counseling, education, and psychology appear to have dismissed the importance of culture in their disciplines.

Responses from the Chicano faculty seem to partially support this conclusion. Responses were mixed regarding colleague acceptance of multicultural issues as central to the scope of the profession (Question 28). Ivy (1977) presents a powerful argument for the examination of cultural dimensions within existing curriculum. According to Ivy, a goal for advanced graduate training is cultural expertise:

> Culturally experienced and effective individuals who are able to generate new sentences, and therefore new world views, and who can communicate with a majority of individuals in their environment are maximally adapted for survival. . .
> . . . The individual with cultural expertise is a person who lives in relationship with other individuals, groups, and cultures. He or she is able to meet the world and the people in it in-depth. Rather than being enveloped by culture, the culturally experienced and effective individual creates as well as carries culture. (p. 301)

A major rationale for the initial questionnaire was as a pilot for future use. Over two thirds of the respondents have provided additional, and detailed comments. Half of the respondents were encouraging, hoping the research would prove useful. Many requested copies of the results, and several asked to be contacted by phone for additional input. Overall, initial response has been extremely positive. Follow-up is needed before more reliable conclusions can be drawn, however.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The final section is designed to synthesize the preceding sections with attention directed to areas of concern for future study on the impact and status of minority students and faculty within predominately white universities. The section is loosely organized around three recommendations and conclusions.

1. Demographic data concerning the number and the characteristics of minority students and faculty within universities have escaped adequate description. Knowledge beyond descriptive data is needed. Organizational theory and research methodology need to be applied to examining the climate and structure of academia (i.e., the *culture* of academia) as it relates to the attitudes, role perceptions, and functions of minority faculty and students. Such research needs to be conducted at departmental, college, and university levels. Accurate information is also needed concerning the composition and nature of graduate programs in all departments of psychology and education to discover existing patterns of exclusion. The following questions need to be answered: Are departments attracting minority students equally in all areas of psychology including clinical, counseling, developmental, learning, experimental, social, and physiological? Do departments that are successful in recruiting and retaining minority students differ from departments that are not successful? If so, how? Finally, careful consideration must be given to patterns of adaptation of minority faculty within white universities.

2. Universities, foundations, governmental agencies, and professional organizations must continue to support and fund symposiums, conferences, and grants which study the status, attitudes, and roles of minority faculty. For example, more information is needed regarding the assimilation patterns of Chicanos.

3. Minority faculty should concentrate efforts on the development, implementation, and dissemination of graduate psychology curriculum materials dealing with cultural pluralism. Such curriculum materials should be phased into existing course offerings. All course offerings should be

reviewed and modules incorporating cultural issues integrated into class lectures and assignments. Finally, evaluation of efforts to change curriculum should be reported in professional literature. Efforts to modify curriculum and the need to attract minority students and faculty must both become a part of the *culture of academia* and not remain apart from it.

TABLE 1

Distribution of Graduate Students in Clinical, Counseling and School Psychology Programs 1972-76

		BLACK	WHITE	HISPANIC	OTHER (a)	TOTAL
1972-73	Clinical	4.69	91.31	N/A*	4.00	10,037
	Counseling	5.27	88.19	1.56	4.98	2,694
	School	2.11	93.31	1.06	3.52	284
1973-74	Clinical	5.01	89.49	1.67	3.83	10,645
	Counseling	5.39	89.49	1.74	3.38	2,131
	School	1.88	93.12	2.19	2.81	320
1974-75	Clinical	5.52	89.72	0.91	3.85	12,053
	Counseling	7.63	87.60	2.09	2.68	3,354
	School	3.68	92.64	1.48	2.20	543
1975-76	Clinical	5.75	88.59	1.79	3.87	11,651
	Counseling	6.55	87.16	2.91	3.38	3,161
	School	6.67	89.95	1.60	1.78	1,124

Note: All figures, except the total, are expressed as a percentage of the respective total shown in the last column.

(a) includes Native American, Oriental and foreign graduate students.

*Not Available

Table 2

Distribution of Faculty in Psychology Programs From 1973-73 to 1975-76

	1972-73				1973-74				1974-75				1975-76			
	Black	White	Hisp.	(a) Other	Black	White	Hisp.	Other	Black	White	Hisp.	Other	Black	White	Hisp.	Other
Inst/Lect.	3.53	93.29	0.36	2.82	4.13	91.75	1.27	2.85	3.95	92.71	0.91	2.43	9.80	85.72	1.22	3.26
Asst. Prof.	1.96	95.81	0.28	1.95	3.42	93.63	0.47	2.48	5.43	91.18	0.76	2.63	5.07	92.26	0.83	1.84
Assoc. Prof.	1.24	97.52	0.34	0.90	1.91	96.36	0.37	1.36	1.32	96.29	0.66	1.73	1.22	96.63	0.75	1.40
Full Prof.	0.80	98.00	0.24	0.96	0.58	98.04	0.14	1.24	0.62	97.63	0.17	1.58	0.58	97.91	0.17	1.34
Total	52	3,380	10	49	78	3,680	15	67	104	4,278	23	88	103	3,932	23	66

Note: All figures, except the ones in the last row, are expressed as percentages. For each year and for each and every faculty rank designation the percentages for black, white, Hispanic and other add up to 100.00%.

(a) includes Native American, Oriental and foreign faculty members.

Table 3

Demographic Information for
Chicano Faculty (N=19)

	$\bar{x}$	range		
Age	42.4	31-60		
Years as Faculty	10.8	4-25		
RANK	**N**			
Lecturer/Instructor	2			
Assistant Professor	1			
Associate Professor	7			
Professor	9			
	yes	**no**		
Tenure track position	15	4		
	4 or less	**10 or less**	**11-20**	**21 or more**
Articles published	5	5	4	5
	MA	**PHD**		
Highest degree	2	17		

Table 4

Chicano Faculty Responses
to selected questions
(N = 19)

Item	Number of responses *				
	SA	A	N	D	SD
3. As a faculty member I exert little influence on the admission of graduate students in my department.	2	1	2	6	8
8. My department would make curriculum changes to better represent cultural pluralism even if no minorities were employed in the department.	4	3	3	1	8
12. As a faculty member I have made no significant strides in incorporating cultural issues into our total departmental curriculum.	1	4	0	2	12
15. My colleagues agree there is a need for more Chicano faculty in our department.	2	5	2	6	4
21. Claims of discriminatory practices against Chicano Faculty in higher education have been greatly exaggerated.	1	3	0	6	9
27. Members of the Chicano community in our city consider me a spokesperson for Chicano affairs and activities.	2	4	5	4	4
28. My colleagues view my interest in multicultural education issues as peripheral to the wide scope of our Profession.	4	5	1	3	6

*SA = Strongly Agree A = Slightly Agree N = Neutral D = Slightly Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

RESOURCES

American Psychological Association. Minority graduate enrollment: Looking up or peaking out? APA Monitor, January 1977, 8 (1), 16 (author C. Suber).

Arce, C. Chicanos in higher education. Integrateducation, May - June 1976, IXV (3), 14-17.

Bayer, A. E. Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-73. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, August 1973, 8 (2).

Blackwell, J. E., Jackson, M., and Moore, J. W. The status of racial and ethnic minorities in Sociology. American Sociological Association Footnotes, Special Supplement, August 1977.

Borda, O. F. Ciencia Propia y Colonialismo Intelectual. Mexico: Editorial Nuestro Tiempo, 1970.

Boxley, R., and Wagner, N. N. Clinical psychology training programs and minority groups: A survey. Professional Psychology, 1971, 2, 75-81.

Bryant, J. W. A Survey of Black American Doctorates. New York: Ford Foundation, Special Projects in Education, 1970.

Egerton, J. The white sea of higher education. In R. A. Altman and P. O. Snyder (eds.), The Minority Student on the Campus: Expectations and Possibilities. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1971.

Ivy, A. E. Cultural expertise: Toward systematic outcome criteria in counseling and psychological education. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1977, 55, 296-302.

Jacobs, K. F., and Wolman, C. S. Strategies of women academics. In H. Frank (ed.), Women in the Organization. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.

Jones, F. C. The Changing Mood in America: Eroding Commitment. Washington, D. C.: Howard University Press, 1977.

Lester, R. A. Antibias Regulations of Universities; Faculty Problems and Their Solutions. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education Report. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Mommsen, K. G. Career Patterns of Black American Doctorates. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University, 1970.

Moore, W., Jr., and Wagstaff, L. H. Black Educators in White Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.

National Board on Graduate Education. Minority Group Participation in Graduate Education. Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Science, June 1976.

Padilla, A. M., Ruiz, R. A., and Alvarez, R. Community mental health services for the Spanish speaking surnamed population. American Psychologist, 1975, 30, 892-905.

Smith, E. Black counselor educator in a predominately white institution. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1975, 15 (2), 84-94.

Stanford University, Office of Chicano Affairs. Chicano Ph.D.'s and Ph.D. Candidates. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, 1974.

Staples, R. E. The Black scholar in academe. Change, November 1972.

Sue, S. Community mental health services to minority groups: Some optimism, some pessimism. American Psychologist, 1977, 32 (8), 616-624.

Taylor, D. A. Recruitment and training of ethnic minorities in Psychology. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1976, 2 (2), 142-147.